

**From:** [Robert M Ross](#)  
**To:** [SaltonSeaComments;](#)  
**CC:** [saltonsea@water.ca.gov](mailto:saltonsea@water.ca.gov); [Douglas A Barnum;](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on DPEIR: Method of Prioritizing Alternatives for a Selection  
**Date:** Monday, October 23, 2006 8:04:19 AM  
**Attachments:** [Salton Sea Benefit-Cost Analysis.xls](#)

---

Restoration Planning Team, you may find my attached spreadsheet describing a method for prioritizing Alternatives in the DPEIS useful in your deliberations toward selecting an alternative plan. I do not advocate one Alternative over another, rather show how the Alternatives may be prioritized, based on whether interested parties wish to consider (a) only benefits, (b) only costs, or (c) both benefits and costs in the final selection. I quantified benefits by first ranking the restoration criteria, using the order of discussion presented in your Executive Summary, which seemed to discuss criteria in their relative importance based on previous enactments and efforts. These were assigned numbers 15 to 1 in order of presentation in Executive Summary. I then gave each Alternative that numeric value for each criterion if the Executive Summary rated the Alternative the best for that criterion. In some cases one or more Alternatives were rated as second choice pending anticipated technological advances or secondary factors. In this case I awarded the Alternative(s) half the value of the assigned weight for that criterion. These point values were added up for each Alternative across the 15 criteria, for a summed Total with Rank Importance (RI), constituting a Total Benefit variable. These summed values were ranked 1-9 with 1 the least and 9 the greatest ranking Benefit. I then ranked the construction or capitol costs (Rank Cost--Capitol) of each Alternative listed in the Executive Summary, as well as the annual operations and maintenance costs (Rank Cost--O&M). From these I determined the Weighted Rank Cost as the construction/capitol cost rank, modified by the O&M cost rank only when a tie occurred (once) or when the costs of two successive ranks were not significantly different from each other (once). I then calculated the Benefit/Cost ratio from these variables, and ranked those values among the 9 Alternatives.

If the interested parties deem only the relative benefits to be important in the final analysis, then only Rank Benefit should be used to decide the favored Alternative. If interested parties deem only the costs to be important for the restoration, then only Rank Costs (Weighted) should be used for a decision. If

both benefits and costs are considered necessary and important in a decision, then the ranked Benefits/Costs ratio (Rank B/C) should be used to determine a preferred alternative. This analysis readily allows for changes in relative importance of criteria, should new information arise or different interpretation of criteria be needed or for change in least impact determination among the Alternatives, should that be necessary upon further analysis/review.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute further to a sound and lasting restoration of this valuable resource.

Robert M. Ross, Ecologist  
United States Geological Survey  
Northern Appalachian Research Laboratory  
176 Straight Run Road  
Wellsboro, PA 16901  
570-724-3322x239  
Fax 570-724-2525  
rossr@usgs.gov

"What a country chooses to save is what a country chooses to say about itself."  
- Mollie Beattie, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1993-1996